

32

THE PRESENT CONDITION AND FUTURE PROSPECTS OF THE COUNTRY.

S P E E C H

OF

HON. ALEXANDER LONG, OF OHIO,

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 8, 1864.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. LONG said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I speak to-day for the preservation of the Government, and, although for the first time within these walls, I propose to indulge in that freedom of speech and latitude of debate so freely exercised by other gentlemen for the past four months, and which is admissible under the rules in the present condition of the House; but for what I may say and the position I shall occupy upon this floor and before the country I alone will be responsible, and, in the independence of a Representative of the people, I intend to proclaim the deliberate convictions of my judgment in this fearful hour of the country's peril.

And now, Mr. Chairman, as we are in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, let us inquire how stands the Union to-day?

A little over three years ago the present occupant of the Presidential mansion, at the other end of the avenue, came into this city under cover of night, disguised in plaid cloak and Scotch cap, lest, as was feared by his friends, he might have received a warmer greeting than would have been agreeable, on his way through Baltimore, at the hands of the constituents of the honorable gentleman from Maryland, (Mr. DAVIS.) On the 4th of March he was inaugurated, and in his address deprecated civil war, using that ever to be memorable language, "suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always, and when, after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you." Seven States had up to that time seceded from the Union. All believed that war would be averted. At the conclusion of the address the lamented Douglas, who had closely watched every word as it escaped from the lips of the President, turned to a friend and,

with tears in his eyes, "thanked God that after all the election of Abraham Lincoln would not involve the nation in war."

A secret meeting of the Governors of a number of States was soon after held in this city. A scheme was devised and a vessel sent out under pretence of furnishing provisions to the troops with Major Anderson in Fort Sumter. On arriving in Charleston harbor the people of that city fired upon the fort. The telegraph bore the news to this city, and on its first mention to the President, he exclaimed, "I knew they would do it," which to my mind is conclusive that it was intended expressly for that purpose. Seventy-five thousand men were immediately called out, war was inaugurated, twenty days were given the insurgents to lay down their arms; an additional five hundred thousand men were soon called for; hostilities commenced. The rebellion was to be crushed inside of sixty days; more troops were called for; the Union was to be restored with all the rights, equality, and dignity of the States unimpaired. No man was permitted to question for a moment the right of the Government to coerce the States back into the Union. To doubt the right or question the speedy suppression of the rebellion and restoration of the Union was to be denounced as a traitor to the Government and a sympathizer with the South.

Thus, sir, was the war inaugurated. The first year passed away; the second came and passed in like manner; so of the third; and now, sir, let me again inquire how stands the Union to-day? The brief period of three short years has produced a fearful change in this free, happy, and prosperous Government; so free in its restraints upon personal liberty, and so gentle in its demands upon the resources of the people that the celebrated Humboldt, after travelling through the country, on his return to Europe, said, "The American people have a Government which you can neither see nor feel." So different is it now, and so great is the change, that the

inquiry might well be made to-day, are we not in Constantinople, in St. Petersburg, in Vienna, in Rome, or in Paris? Military Governors and their Provost Marshals override the laws, and the echo of the armed heel rings forth as clearly now in America as in France or in Austria, and the President sits to-day guarded by armed soldiery, stationed at every approach leading to the Executive mansion.

So far from crushing the rebellion in sixty days, three years have already passed away, and from the day on which the conflict began up to the present hour, the Confederate army has not been forced beyond the sound of their guns from the dome of the Capitol in which we are assembled. The city of Washington is to-day, as it has been for three years, guarded by Federal troops in all the forts and fortifications with which it is surrounded to prevent an attack of the enemy; and as an evidence of the despondency of the Administration, and the unsuccessful opening of the spring campaign of the fourth year in the progress of the war, the *Morning Chronicle* of this city, the President's organ, in an editorial a few mornings since, said: "Charleston has not been taken; Lee maintains a bold front on the Rapidan; the Florida expedition was a failure; the Sherman expedition has not been a success, and the rebels have every where shown more vigor than they were supposed to possess." Although the same paper, and others in support of the Administration, have told the country from time to time during the past winter, that the rebellion was crushed and slavery was dead; that the Confederates were deserting in whole regiments at a time, coming within our lines, taking the oath, and describing the most horrible suffering and demoralization from want of food, clothing, and ill treatment, yet at the very time the people have been so deceived and misled from day to day, the President calls for 500,000 more troops, and in a few weeks follows it with an additional call for 200,000 more, making 700,000 since the 1st of January, and over 2,500,000 since the commencement of the war, out of the 3,500,000 who voted in the so-called loyal States at the last Presidential election when 75,000 militia were to end it in twenty, or at most in sixty days.

Mr. Chairman, I have thus made a very brief statement of facts as to the condition of the Union to-day, and for doing which I have no doubt the usual charge of "encouragement for the rebels," "the prolongation of the war," "the rebels are aided by their friends on this floor," and the like charges will be repeated again by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House; and, as I have heard such charges so repeatedly during the past four months, I say now and here that the real friends of the Confederates—those who give them aid and encouragement, and enable them to carry on the war—are on the opposite side of the House and in the control of the Government. Your confiscation resolution, voted for and

passed by the friends of the Administration, by which you propose to thrust your hands into the coffin of the deceased father, and take all he may have left at his death to his widow and innocent and unoffending children, is worth more than fifty thousand men to the Confederate army. The order issued by the President to Gen. Saxton dividing up and parceling out the State of South Carolina among the negroes and enterprising Yankees of Massachusetts gives courage, energy, and enthusiasm to the men now in arms in the Confederate States. The order of the President to his military commanders in Louisiana and Arkansas, and the order issued in pursuance thereof by Gen. Banks to the people of Louisiana, in which, by a single dash of his pen, he strikes out of existence the Constitution and organic law of the State, and by virtue of the power vested in him as a Major General proceeds to call and hold an election, inaugurate State officers, and set up a State government, and the legislation consummated and proposed by Congress, and speeches made upon this floor in support of radicalism, are strengthening the Confederacy and prolonging the war. Herein, sir, is where they find strength. The true friends of the Confederacy in the North are the Radical Abolitionists, and the radical press goading on the President to issue proclamations and military orders which provide food, raiment, strength, and support for the Confederacy.

If Mr. Lincoln had made a gift of millions of greenbacks to Jefferson Davis, to be used as bounty money in recruiting the Confederate army, he could not have done better service to the cause of the South than he has done by his silly, absurd, and insulting amnesty proclamation, and his equally absurd attempt to create State Governments by dictatorial power. He has in effect said to the Southern people: "You shall not return to the Union except under such local Governments as I and my military officers dictate;" and with the aid of his friends in Congress he is enabled to add: "In the event of your submission and return your estates shall be confiscated; your property, personal and real, shall be taken from you; your children shall be disinherited and left homeless and penniless to starve, under the scorn and hatred of Northern fanatics; your lands and manor houses shall be parcelled out among our retainers; the negro (freedman) and the adventurer shall sit and rule at your hearthstones, and you—beggars and outcasts—shall be forbidden representation in our national councils and be shut out forever from offices of trust and honor." Such is the language in which Mr. Lincoln and this Congress, and the preceding Congress, have spoken and are speaking to the people of the South.

And now, sir, with such a prospect before them, as the sequel of submission, outlawry, disfranchisement, social, moral, and political degradation, penury for themselves and their

children, decreed as their portion, will they throw down their arms and submit to the terms? Who shall believe that the free, proud American blood which courses with as quick pulsation through their veins as our own, will not be spilled to the last drop in resistance? This is the source, sir, from whence comes encouragement, strength, support, and sustenance for the Confederates; herein lies the secret of the unity of their action, the prolongation of the contest, and the desperation of the conflict, produced, not by anything said or measures proposed by gentlemen upon this side of the House, or by any measures proposed or policy advocated by the Democratic party, but by the acts of the gentlemen who make the charges, and the President and his military commanders who issue the proclamations and military orders.

Mr. Chairman, I have deemed it proper thus to advert to the charges of encouragement to the Confederates so repeatedly made upon this floor, and I again recur to the consideration of the Union. Can the Union be restored by war? I answer most unhesitatingly and deliberately no, never; "war is final, eternal separation." My first and highest ground of opposition to its further prosecution is that it is wrong; it is in violation of the Constitution and of the fundamental principles on which the Federal Union was founded. My second objection is that as a policy it is not reconstructive but destructive, and will, if continued, result speedily in the destruction of the Government and the loss of civil liberty to both North and South, and it ought, therefore to immediately cease.

In order, Mr. Chairman, that we may know what views were entertained upon the right as well as expediency of coercing States into submission by some of the departed as well as living statesmen of the country, previous to the commencement of the present war, I propose to call the attention of the House and the country to a few extracts which to my mind are worthy of consideration at this time.

In 1827, during the Administration of John Quincy Adams, when the Legislature of Georgia had passed an act setting aside the laws of Congress regulating intercourse with the Indian tribes within her limits, the messages of the President of the 5th and 8th of February, 1827, in relation thereto, were referred to a select committee of the Senate, of which Col. Benton was chairman, and of which Martin Van Buren and Gen. William H. Harrison, both afterwards President of the United States, were members. The committee, in their report (Senate documents, Second Session, Nineteenth Congress, Document No. 69,) say:

"It is believed to be among those axioms, which in a Government like ours no man may be permitted to dispute, that the only security for the permanent union of these States is to be found in the principle of common affection, resting on the basis of common interest. The sanctions of the Constitution would be impotent to retain, in concerted and

harmonious action, twenty-four sovereignties hostile in their feelings toward each other, and acting under the impulse of a real or imagined diversity of interest. The resort to force would be alike vain and nugatory. Its frequent use would subject it, with demonstrative certainty, to ultimate failure, while its temporary success would be valueless for all purposes of social happiness. In such contests, however unequal, and however transient, the seeds of disunion would be thickly sown, and those who may be destined to witness them will speedily thereafter be called to lament the destruction of the fairest prospect of civil liberty which Heaven in its mercy has vouchsafed to man. The committee will not enlarge upon the frightful consequences of civil wars. They are known to be calamitous to single governments and fatal to confederacies."

The prediction of the committee of the destruction of the fairest prospect of civil liberty which Heaven in its mercy has vouchsafed to man, is already in great danger of being realized, and every hour the war is continued only widens the separation and increases the danger.

But, sir, I propose to introduce the opinion of another departed statesman of the school of politics to which the gentlemen on the other side of the chamber belong, and for whose political opinions they entertain the highest regard. That profound statesman, after the experience of many years in the most exalted positions of the nation, and with a perfect knowledge of the subject upon which he spoke, said:

"Nations acknowledge no judge between them upon earth, and their Governments from necessity must, in their intercourse with each other, decide when the failure of one party to a contract to perform its obligations absolves the other from the reciprocal fulfilment of his own. But this last of earthly powers is not necessary to the freedom and independence of States connected together by the immediate action of the people of which they consist. To the people alone is there reserved as well the dissolving as the constituent power, and that power can be exercised by them only under the tie of conscience binding them to the retributive justice of Heaven. With these qualifications we may admit the same right as vested in the people of every State in the Union with reference to the General Government, which was exercised by the people of the United Colonies with reference to the supreme head of the British Empire, of which they formed a part, and under these limitations have the people of each State in the Union a right to secede from the Confederated Union itself. Thus stands the right. But the indissoluble link of Union between the people of the several States of this confederated nation is, after all, not in the right, but in the heart. If the day should ever come (may heaven avert it!) when the affections of the people of these States shall be alienated from each other; when the fraternal spirit shall give way to cold indifference, or collision of interest shall fester into hatred, the bands of political association will not long hold together parties no longer attracted by the magnetism of conciliated interests and kindly sympathies; and far better it will be for the people of the disunited States to part in friendship from each other than to be held together by constraint. Then will be the time for reverting to the precedents which occurred at the formation and adoption of the Constitution to form again a more per-

fect Union by dissolving that which could no longer bind, and to leave the separated parts to be reunited by the laws of political gravitation to the centre."

Thus, Mr. Chairman, spoke John Quincy Adams, in an address delivered before the New York Historical Society on the 30th of April, 1839, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States. Mr. Adams was a believer in the doctrine therein set forth, and the leaders of the party to which he belonged shared in that belief, and continued to do so until the commencement of the present unnatural civil war. If it was sound doctrine before secession took place and the war began, what is there in either to change the principle?

Andrew Jackson, in his farewell address to the American people, has solemnly warned them that the citizens of one section of the country arrayed in arms against the other would be the end of the Union and an end of the hope of freedom. He says:

"If such a struggle is once begun, and the citizens of one section of the country are arrayed in arms against those of the other in doubtful conflict, let the battle result as it may, there will be an end of the Union, and with it an end of the hope of freedom. The victory of the injured would not secure to them the blessings of liberty; it would avenge their wrongs, but they would themselves share in the common ruin. The Constitution cannot be maintained nor the Union preserved, in opposition to public feeling, by the mere exertion of the coercive power of the Government."

But this opinion, that the Union cannot be preserved by the coercive power of the Government, was not confined to the departed statesmen of the country.

William H. Seward, in his letter of April 11, 1861, to Mr. Adams, our Minister to England, said:

"For these reasons, the President would not be disposed to reject a cardinal doctrine of theirs, (the rebels,) namely: that the Federal Government could not reduce the seceding States to obedience by conquest, even though he were disposed to question that proposition. But in fact the President willingly accepts it as true. Only an imperial or despotic government could subjugate thoroughly disaffected and insurrectionary members of the State. This Federal Republican system of ours is of all forms of government the very one which is most unfitted for such labor."

Such was the language of the Secretary of State in April, 1861, three days before the Sunday on which the President wrote his proclamation calling out seventy-five thousand troops, but after seven States had seceded. The Secretary shared in the fears of the President, that the attempt to subjugate the South would destroy the Government. Three years of civil war in a vain and fruitless effort at subjugation attest and prove to-day the correctness of the opinion then held by the President: "Only an imperial or despotic government could subjugate thoroughly disaffected and insurrectionary members of the

State." "This Federal Republican system of ours is of all forms of government the most unfitted for such labor." Who does not believe it? If there is truth in the Declaration of Independence, and the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House will certainly not dispute it, since they incorporated it in the Chicago platform which became a law unto the President; who, I ask, can deny the conclusion of the Secretary of State, having in view always, as he and the President undoubtedly had, the great cardinal truth underlying all republican governments "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed?" If the President and his Secretary of State gave utterance to truth in 1861, is it any less a truth to-day? Has not rather the experience of three years of war confirmed it? I believed it then. I believe it now.

But, sir I have still other witnesses to call. The honorable Senator from Ohio, [Mr. WADE,] as reported in the *Congressional Globe*, third session Thirty-Fourth Congress, page 25, said:

"You cannot forcibly hold men in this Union for the attempt to do so, it seems to me, would subvert the first principles of the Government under which we live."

On the 10th of June, 1864, *Congressional Globe*, page 94, the present Chief Magistrate of the nation said:

"Any people, anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have a right to rise up and *shake off the existing Government*, and form a *new one* that suits them better." * * *

"Nor is this right confined to cases in which the people of any existing Government may choose to exercise it. *Any portion* of such people that can may revolutionize and may make their own so much of the territory as *they inhabit*. More than this, a majority of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a minority intermingled with or near about them, who may oppose their movements."

Now, Mr. Chairman, who I ask has gone further in favor of the right of revolution than that? Do any of these men in the South claim more than is there conceded by Mr. Lincoln himself. Is he not on the record in as plain and concise language as it is possible for a man to place himself?

But, sir, I propose to call another witness to testify against this coercive policy, who also spoke in advance of the war. Edward Everett, in his letter of May 29, 1860, to Washington Hunt, accepting the nomination as Vice President of the Union party, of which, I believe, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. HENRY WINTER DAVIS], was a member, and for whom a number of gentlemen upon this floor voted, then said:

"The suggestion that the Union can be maintained by numerical preponderance and military prowess of one section exerted to coerce the other into submission is, in my judgment, as self-contradictory as it is dangerous. It comes loaded with the death-smell from fields wet with brothers' blood. If the vital principle of all republican governments 'is the consent of the governed,'

much more does a union of coequal sovereign States require, as its basis, the harmony of its members and their voluntary co-operation in its organic functions."

It will no doubt be said that Mr. Everett has changed his views upon the subject. That may be so, but I have not. I believed it sound doctrine in 1860 before secession occurred or coercion began. Three years experience in attempting "by numerical preponderance and military prowess of one section exerted to coerce the other into submission" has convinced me more thoroughly that it is "as self-contradictory as it is dangerous"—contradictory because it violates the great principles of free government, which "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" and dangerous because, by its exercise, especially when wielded by a weak, vacillating, and unscrupulous man, it destroys instead of maintaining the Union, Constitutions, and organic law; civil liberty and personal security are forced to yield to what is claimed to be a military necessity; and the Government itself, in the brief period of three short years, is to-day verging on the very brink of ruin.

I am well aware, sir, that the cry of disloyalty, want of patriotism, and lack of devotion to the Government, which is in every place and at all times raised against those who have the independence to disapprove of any of the acts of Mr. Lincoln, as well as an inordinate desire for Government patronage, from the building of a steamship and a shoddy contract down to the insignificant position of taking charge of mutilated and depreciated greenbacks in the Treasury building, has changed the opinion of many men, but the fixed principles of free government, as well as the rules of right, reason, justice and truth, are unchangeable; and although it may be unpopular and even at the risk of personal liberty in times like the present to advocate them, they are nevertheless eternal and immutable.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. STEVENS,] who stands upon this floor and before the country as an acknowledged leader of the Administration party, has had the honesty and independence, in a speech delivered at an early part of the session, to announce what he holds to be the true position of the Confederate States. He says:

"Some think that these States are still in the Union, and entitled to the protection of the Constitution and the laws of the United States."

This idea he at once repudiates, and then boldly affirms that which he holds to be the true doctrine:

"Others hold that, having committed treason, renounced their allegiance to the Union, discarded the Constitution and laws, organized a distinct and hostile government, and by force of arms have risen from the condition of insurgents to the position of an independent Power *de facto*; and having been acknowledged as a belligerent both by foreign na-

tions and our own Government, the Constitution and the Union are abrogated, so far as they are concerned; and that as between the two belligerents they are under the laws of war and the laws of nations alone, and that whichever Power conquers may treat the vanquished as conquered provinces, and may impose upon them such conditions and laws as it may deem best."

In answer to any objections that may be raised to this position, he says:

"But it is said that this must be considered a contest with rebel individuals only, as States in the Union cannot make war. That is true so long as they remain in the Union; but they claim to be out of the Union, and the very fact that we have admitted them to be in a state of war, to be belligerents, shows that they are no longer in the Union, and that they are waging war in their corporate capacity, under the corporate name of the Confederate States, and that such major corporation is composed of minor corporations called States, acting in their associated character.

"When an insurrection becomes sufficiently formidable to entitle the party to belligerent rights, it places the contending powers on precisely the same footing as foreign nations at war with each other.

"No one acquainted with the magnitude of this contest can deny to it the character of a civil war. For nearly three years the Confederate States have maintained their declaration of independence by force of arms.

"What, then, is the effect of this public war between these belligerents, these foreign nations? Before this war the parties were bound together by a compact, by a treaty called a 'Constitution.' They acknowledged the validity of municipal laws mutually binding on each other. This war has cut asunder all these ligaments, abrogated all the obligations."

Now, sir, for once at least, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the Confederate States are out of the Union, occupying the position of an independent power *de facto*; have been acknowledged as a belligerent, both by foreign nations and our own Government; maintained their declaration of independence for three years by force of arms; and that the war has cut asunder all the ligaments and abrogated all the obligations that bound them under the Constitution. So far I agree with him, and, however unwilling we may be to accept such position as the actual condition of the Confederate States, the history of the past three years, the law of nations, the genius of our government, and a regard for truth compel me at least to accept it and my judgment to approve it; and, if the charge of disloyalty is brought against me for this opinion, I have only to shield myself under the broad mantle of the distinguished leader of the Republican party.

At the commencement of the war England and France both declared the Confederate States to be belligerents; the United States has treated with them as such in the exchange of prisoners, and the Administration is to-day, without the honesty or independence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to avow it, doing precisely what he proposes to do under

his war of conquest, waged against the Confederate States as a foreign nation.

It is not now even pretended that the war is carried on having for its object the restoration of the Union. "Reconstruction," "consolidation," "centralization," "with an entire change in the Constitution," are the terms employed in speaking of the government that is to exist hereafter. To speak of the Constitution as it is and the Union as it was is an offence subjecting an officer in the army to punishment by dismissal from the service, and conclusive evidence of disloyalty in the citizen. If the time ever was when the Union could have been restored by war, which I do not believe, it has long since been dispelled by emancipation, confiscation, amnesty and the like proclamations; military orders annulling State constitutions, setting aside State laws, obliterating State lines, and attempting to organize and set up a form of State government in their stead, in which one man out of ten who shall turn abolitionist, take and subscribe an oath to execute and obey the will of Abraham Lincoln, whatever it may be, shall govern and rule over the remaining nine-tenths who refuse to become abolitionists.

These follies of the Administration, and others of like character, have, instead of "crushing the rebellion," crushed out whatever Union sentiment may have remained among the Southern people. It is possible that in districts of country occupied by the army, occasionally a man may be found, who, seeing nothing before him but ignominy and death, his wife and innocent children appealing to him for protection with all the ties of filial affection, his property to be confiscated, and his family to become outcasts and beggars in the world, that such a man, in order for the time being, to save himself, save his family, and save his property, may take the oath, but the effect of it will be, like that of Galileo, who invented the telescope, and who first taught the rotary motion of the earth.

That noble old Italian, after many years of labor in the study of science, and when he had advanced to the extreme age of seventy, was summoned before an inquisition, tried, condemned, and imprisoned in a dungeon for teaching a heresy; subsequently he was brought out and offered liberty on condition of renouncing his heretical doctrine. The effect of beholding the glorious light of the sun and breathing again the pure air of heaven as contrasted with the loathsome dungeon in which he had been cast, and to which he must return or renounce his belief in the earth's motion, so far overcame his humanity that he consented to comply, and upon his bended knees, with his hands upon the gospels, he abjured his belief in the Copernican doctrine. Part of his oburation ran in these terms: "With a sincere heart and unfeigned faith, I abjure, curse, and detest the said errors and heresies, (viz. that the earth moves, &c.) I swear that I will never in future say or assert

anything verbally or in writing which may give rise to a similar suspicion against me." Rising from his knees, with his eyes still fixed on the earth, he whispered to a friend, "*E pur si muove.*" "It moves for all that."

So it will be with the man who is forced to take the oath to save himself, his family, and his property. He may take it, but in his heart he will detest and despise the authority that requires it. Will such a man be devoted to or make a good citizen of the Government in which he lives? The history of Poland, of Hungary, of Ireland, and of Italy furnishes an answer to the question. If imperial Governments are not able to hold in submissive obedience small portions of a vast empire, once in revolt, how much less a Government having for its basis the consent of the governed.

But "subjugation" is the watchword. Liberty and freedom for the slave, and subjugation and extermination for the master, is the popular cry. "Meet them, fight them, crush them," says the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. GREEN CLAY SMITH.] Sir, that is easily said upon this floor, and is popular with those who from day to day fill the gallery of this House; but even the gentleman from Kentucky, as well as a number of other military gentlemen, were quite willing to forego the pleasure of the performance, and exchange their commissions as Generals in the field for a certificate entitling them to a seat upon this floor. And were I to judge by the willingness with which it was done, the tenacity with which they hold on to it, and the efforts some of them are making to return here again, instead of the war spirit they breathe within these walls, I should strongly suspect them of being in sympathy with the peace party.

Mr. Chairman, I am no military man, and therefore incompetent to give advice or advance an opinion in military affairs, but I have often been forcibly struck by the remarks of Marshal Ney, in reply to Napoleon, as related by Headly in his "Napoleon and his Marshals." "One day at Madrid, Napoleon entered the room where Ney and several officers were standing, and said in great glee, everything goes on well; Romania will be reduced in a fortnight; the English are defeated and will be unable to advance; in three months the war will be finished." The officers to whom this was addressed made no reply, but Ney, shaking his head, said with his characteristic bluntness, "Sire, this war has lasted long already, and our affairs are not improved. The people are obstinate; even their women and children fight; they massacre our men in detail. To-day we cut the enemy in pieces, to-morrow we have to oppose another twice as numerous. It is not an army we have to fight; it is a whole nation. I see no end to this business." "Bonaparte followed his own inclinations, and was eventually defeated."

Mr. Chairman, is there not instruction in the blunt yet forcible reply of the old French Marshal to his superior officer for us? Have

we not had, from time to time, the predictions of Napoleon during the past three years, but without a Marshal Ney to say "I see no end to this business."

But, Mr. Chairman, how do we stand in the eyes of the civilized world to-day, in waging a war of subjugation and conquest against the Confederate States, which have seceded from us and set up a government of their own? Are we not inconsistent with all our former acts! Have we not been early to admit this proper with regard to others? There never was a people on the face of the earth that demanded an independent government that did not have the sympathy of the American people; and ought we now to shrink from the doctrine we have been so willing to apply to others? My earliest recollection is the appeal made by Clay and Webster in behalf of Greece, in 1824, when they so eloquently declaimed in that behalf on this floor and in the other branch of Congress. Whether it was Greece, or the States of South America, or Poland, or Hungary, or Italy or Ireland, the fact that a large country, for any cause, demanded a distinct and separate Government, always received the warmest sympathy and support of the American people, irrespective of party.

Even as late as December, 1860, after Mr. Lincoln was elected, and after the preliminary steps for secession had been taken, the paper having the largest circulation of any in the Republican party, and having more influence than any other in the formation of Republican opinion, declared that it could see no reason why, if three millions of colonists could separate from the British Crown in 1776, that five millions of Southerners could not separate from us in 1861. I have been as much puzzled as the distinguished Republican editor, Mr. Greeley, to find, looking at it as a revolutionary right, the difference in position.

Ought we to shrink from the application of a doctrine to ourselves which we have been so willing to apply to other nations, such as Austria, Russia, and Spain; if we do, what will be the judgment of impartial history? How much better it would have been for us and for the cause of Democracy throughout the globe. What a splendid tribute it would have been to a Republican Government if we had parted in peace with our dissatisfied sister States, as Mr. Everett recommended as late as February, 1861, sustained by such leading Republican journals as the *Cincinnati Commercial*, *New York Tribune*, *Indianapolis Journal*, *Chicago Tribune*, *New Haven (Connecticut) Palladium*, *Columbus Journal*, and *Salmon P. Chase*, now Secretary of the Treasury, and many others of that school. What in monarchical countries had required a long and bloody war, would have been accomplished by Democratic principles and a Republican sense of justice. What a splendid proof it would have afforded of the capacity of the people for self-government! What a val-

uable lesson it would have conveyed to the whole civilized world! The fact that we could rise superior to all prejudices and passions and to have conquered ourselves would have been the highest triumph that we had ever achieved.

I regret as much, Mr. Chairman, as any gentleman upon this floor, that any of our sister States should have desired to cut asunder the ligaments that bound them to us. None would be more willing than myself to make any reasonable sacrifice to induce them to return to their partnership with us, but still recognising the truth of the doctrine taught by the fathers of the republic, and so fairly expressed by Mr. John Quincy Adams, that our government was after all in the heart and that it would be better, severe as would be the pang of regret, to part in friendship rather than to hold sovereign States pinned to us by the bayonet, as Mr. Greeley expressed it in 1861. What advance have we made in the science and principles of governments, Mr. Chairman, if we cannot rise above the Austro-Russian principle of holding subject provinces by the power of force and coercion? What becomes of the Declaration of Independence and of all our teachings for eighty years!

After all, Mr. Chairman, it is not the extent of territory which should be the object of our desires. Better sacrifice over nine-tenths of the territory than destroy our republican form of government. What our people desired in 1861, and which I honored though I regarded as mistaken, was the preservation of the government and the retention of our jurisdiction over the whole territory. They were rightly willing to sacrifice every material consideration for that purpose. Land is nothing, Mr. Chairman, compared to liberty. We existed as a republic when the mouth of the Mississippi was held by a foreign power, when we had nothing west of that river, when Florida was held against us; and we could exist again if by the chastisement of heaven we should be curtailed to our old territorial dimensions. For fifteen millions of dollars we purchased the whole of that immense territory, and were it a hundred thousand times as valuable its preservation would not be worth our admirable form of government. Pride of territorial ambition is a vulgar and low ambition of national greatness. Russia and even China can vie with us in that, but who would not rather reside in one of the Cantons of Switzerland, or in Great Britain, than in those countries?

It is not in the extent of territory that we possess, but in the manner in which we govern it that renders us respectable. Many gentlemen seem rather to look to the quantity than the quality. All republics have been destroyed by the thirst of territorial aggrandizement and the lust of conquest. The great object of our Government should be to develop and cultivate the internal resources of those friendly to its jurisdiction rather than to extend it over hostile and sovereign people. It is in that character that true patriotism is

to be cultivated and true national glory found. Especially should all republics cultivate the arts of peace, since it is by the war power that free governments are commonly overturned. The charge has been made that democracy is turbulent, warlike, and aggressive; but if so it is a terrible misconception of its true interests, for upon the people fall the awful calamities of armed collisions. An eminent poet has said—that war was a game which, if the people were wise, kings and princes would never play at. The venerable Dr. Franklin, at the close of his illustrious career, remarked: "That there never was a good war and a bad peace."

We have made, Mr. Chairman, by this war, eight million of bitter enemies upon the American continent. While time shall last the recollection of this bloody strife will never fade from the memories of the people North and South, but will be handed down to the latest generation. The words Shiloh, Antietam, Gettysburg, Murfreesboro, Richmond, Vicksburg, and Fort Donelson are words of division and disunion, and will serve to bring up emotions of eternal hate. If it were true, as was alleged by a distinguished Senator from Ohio, [Mr. WADE,] in a speech in Portland in 1855, "that he believed that no two nations on earth hated each other as much as the North and South," how much more true is the remark now after they have been arrayed in such bloody contests!

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois. As the speech of the gentleman from Ohio is the key-note of the Democratic party in the coming election, I hope there will be no objection to his finishing his speech. [Cries of "Order!"] It means recognition of the confederacy by foreign Powers, and peace upon terms of disunion. [Renewed cries of "Order!"]

No objection being made,

Mr. LONG proceeded:

It is the object of the sword to cut and cleave asunder, but never to unite. What union is there between Russia and Poland, between Austria and Hungary, between England and Catholic Ireland, where the sword and the bayonet for centuries have been employed? Instead of conferring national strength, they are sources of weakness to countries that hold them in subjection, and which would this day be stronger without them than with them.

Mr. Chairman, these lessons of history are full of warning and example. Much better would it have been for us in the beginning—much better would it be for us now—to consent to a division of our magnificent empire and cultivate amicable relations with our estranged brethren, than to seek to hold them to us by the power of the sword. Here let me advert to the common yet perfectly glaring and apparent error, that to part with our jurisdiction over eleven States involves the destruction of the Government. The statement of

the proposition demonstrates its absurdity. As well might one say, who had a farm of two hundred acres of land, that he had lost his title deed to all of it because, by some misfortune, he had parted with fifty. In losing the South, not one function of our Government over us is surrendered. It remains over us as completely sovereign as it ever did.

Here let me say, as the experience of my individual belief, that if it had been understood in the North, as in the South, that by the terms of the Federal compact a State had a right to secede from the Union, this disruption would never have occurred. Had the North so understood the matter there would have been upon its part a forbearance from the exercise of extreme measures and a desire not to press the Southern States to the wall that would ever have maintained the Confederacy unbroken. It was the prevalence of the idea of the consolidationists in the North that the Southern States had no right to and would not secede that tempted them into that fatal policy that has sundered the Confederacy. It is said no confederacy can exist by a recognition of this principle; but such was not the view of the fathers of our Government; it was not the view of Jefferson and Madison in their immortal resolutions of 1798 and 1799. It has been said, Mr. Chairman, that it would make a confederacy a rope of sand, but if so it is strange that the Southern Confederacy, where it is recognized, should hold together through such a bloody pressure as we have applied to it for the last three years; it is a strange rope of sand that endures all that.

But to return, Mr. Chairman. As will be judged, perhaps, by the tenor of these remarks, I am reluctantly and despondingly forced to the conclusion that the Union is lost, never to be restored. I regard all dreams of the restoration of the Union, which was the pride of my life, and to restore which even now I would pour out my heart's blood, as worse than idle. I see neither North nor South any sentiment on which it is possible to build a Union. Those elements of union which Mr. Adams described have by the process of time been destroyed. Worse, yea worse than that, Mr. Chairman. I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that in attempting to preserve our jurisdiction over the Southern States we have lost our constitutional form of government over the Northern. What has been predicted by our wisest and most eminent statesmen has come to pass; in grasping at the shadow, we have lost the substance; in striving to retain the casket of liberty in which our jewels were confined, we have lost those precious muniments of freedom.

Our Government, as all know, is not anything resembling what it was three years ago. There is not one single vestige of the Constitution remaining; every clause and every letter of it has been violated, and I have no idea myself that it will ever again be respected. Revolutions never go backward to the

point at which they started. There has always been a large party in this country favorable to a strong or monarchical Government, and they have now all the elements upon which to establish one. They have a vast army, an immense public debt, and an irresponsible Executive. Ambitious to retain power, he is a candidate for re-election; and as commander-in-chief, it is charged (whether true or false I shall not undertake to decide) that he has already used the army in the Florida expedition to advance his chances of success. One of the Generals he has decapitated (Gen. Fremont) has entered the field to dispute his claim to a continuance in power; and if the *Chronicle* of this city, the President's organ, is correct in its construction of the suggestions of the New York *Herald*, speaking of Lieutenant General Grant, the question is already mooted whether he, in certain contingencies, at the head of the army, would not be justified in assuming the reins of Government.

The very idea upon which this war is founded—coercion of States—leads to despotism; to preserve a republican form of government under any constitution, under the prevalence of the doctrines now in vogue, is clearly impossible. These convictions of the complete overthrow of our government are as unwelcome and unpleasant to me as they are to any member of this House. Would to God the facts were such that I could cherish other convictions! I may be denounced as disloyal and unpatriotic for entertaining them, but it will only be by shallow fools and arrant knaves who do not know or will not admit the difference between recognising a fact and creating its existence. A man may not desire to die, but nevertheless his belief will not alter the fact of his mortality.

I shall not in these remarks revive the unpleasant and acrimonious controversy of who is responsible for the death and destruction of our Republic. I do not see that any such discussion now would be productive of good. I entertain clear and strong convictions upon that point, convictions that I have no doubt will be shared in by the impartial historian of the future. For the present I am willing to let the past with all its recollections rest, provided we can snatch from the common ruin some of our old relics of freedom. I do not share in the belief entertained by many of my political friends on this floor and elsewhere that any peace is attainable upon the basis of Union and reconstruction. If the Democratic party were in power to-day I have no idea, and honesty compels me to declare it, that they could restore the Union of thirty-four States. My mind has undergone an entire change upon that subject. And I believe now that there are but two alternatives, and these are, either an acknowledgment of the independence of the South as an independent nation, or their complete subjugation and extermination as a people, and of these alternatives I prefer the former.

Mr. Chairman, I take little or no interest in the discussion of the question which many

of my political friends would make an issue as to how this war shall be prosecuted, its manner and object. I regard that as worse than trifling with the great question. I do not believe there can be any prosecution of the war against a sovereign State under the Constitution, and I do not believe that a war so carried on can be prosecuted so as to render it proper, justifiable, or expedient. An unconstitutional war can only be carried on in an unconstitutional manner, and to prosecute it further under the idea of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. STEVENS,] as a war waged against the Confederate States as an independent nation, for the purpose of conquest and subjugation, as he proposes, and the Administration is in truth and in fact doing, I am equally opposed.

I will say further, Mr. Chairman, that if this war is to be still further prosecuted, I, for one, prefer that it shall be done under the auspices of those who now conduct its management, as I do not wish the party with which I am connected to be in any degree responsible for its results, which cannot be otherwise than disastrous and suicidal. Let the responsibility remain where it is until we can have a change of policy instead of men, if such a thing is possible. Nothing could be more fatal for the Democratic party than to seek to come into power pledged to a continuance of the war policy. Such a policy would be a libel upon its creed in the past and the ideas that lie at the basis of all free governments, and would lead to its complete demoralization and ruin. I believe the masses of the Democratic party are for peace; that they would be placed in a false position if they should nominate a war candidate for the Presidency, and seek to make the issue upon the narrow basis of how the war should be prosecuted. For my own part, as I have already indicated, I fear that our old Government cannot be preserved even under the best auspices and under any policy that may be now adopted; yet I desire to see the Democratic party, with which I have always been connected, preserve its consistency and republican character unshaken.

When Mr. LONG had concluded—

Mr. GARFIELD, of Ohio, rose and severely denounced the speech of his colleague. The issue, he said, was now made up. We should use the common instruments of war, and if with these we should not succeed, he would take means as he would against the savage who attacked himself or family. He would resort to any element of destruction, and, if necessary, he would fling all constitutional sanctions to the winds.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I desire but a very few minutes to reply to my colleague who has seen proper to call in question very seriously what I have said this afternoon. I stated, sir, very distinctly when I commenced that I spoke for myself, and that I alone would be responsible for what I said. I am well aware of all that I did say. I have said it deliberately. I have said it because my conscience told me it was right and my judgment approved it. I have said it because when I

walked down with my colleague to the front of that desk to take the oath required of me in becoming a member of this House, I held up my hand, as he raised his, before Heaven and took upon myself a solemn oath to support the Constitution of the United States; and so help me God, fearless of all the charges that can be made against me by that gentleman or any other, or by all the minions of power in the land, I never will violate that oath, or shrink from the responsibility which I then assumed.

I have never, sir, belonged to a party which took that oath with a mental reservation. I never took the oath with a determination not to obey a part of the laws of the land. I remember the district of country from which my colleague hails, the conventions that have been held there, and the forcible resistance to the enforcement of the law that have been made there. I remember when the party now in power undertook to set aside a solemn act of Congress and appealed to the supreme court of our State to override the Constitution of the United States. Sir, I have never been guilty of that crime. I have never, I repeat, belonged to a party that takes this oath with a mental reservation. It seems to me that if my colleague had desired to stand right before the House and before the country, before he assumed the responsibility of charging me individually with being disloyal, he should have remembered the authorities that I brought before the House, and when he branded me as disloyal would have recollected that the leaders of his own party and the organs of his own party, from the *New York Tribune* down to the *Columbus Journal* of the State in which he and I live, have advocated the doctrines that I have promulgated here to-day, and that the Secretary of the Treasury, hailing from our State also, advocates this identical doctrine.

Then, sir, if that be treason, all these men are traitors. I preferred to get my authority from the party to which my colleague belongs when I put myself before the House and country as I have done to-day. I then say, "If that be treason, make the most of it—make the most of it." I have brought here the authorities. In my judgment they are correct and sound. I have not, perhaps, had the opportunities of some other gentlemen on this floor, but my earliest inspirations were those of love and admiration for my country, and for the distinguished statesmen who have adorned the pages of her history. I have not been an unconcerned spectator of what has taken place. When I read the eloquent appeals of Clay and Webster, when I read the eloquent oration of John Quincy Adams, when I read the report which I have produced to-day of Thomas H. Benton, Martin Van Buren, and William H. Harrison, when I referred, as I have, to what the Secretary of State said three days before the Sunday when the proclamation for seventy-five thousand men was issued, and to what Edward Everett said before coercion had commenced, when I referred to what was said by a Senator from Ohio [B. F. WADE] and the present occupant of the presidential chair, when I referred to all these,

I knew that they were very nearly all leaders of the party to which gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber belong. Then, sir, if I am a traitor, equally so are they! All that I ask is that I may be credited with honesty and sincerity of convictions, and for independence in declaring them in this House and before the country. I am willing to abide the consequences and take the responsibility.

Now, sir, as to the charge in respect to Knights of the Golden Circle, I have no knowledge of any such thing. So help me God I never had, and with God's help I never will have—never! I am a member of no political secret organization. I have never been a member of any except one which was known as the Miami tribe in the city where I live. I defy the world to point to a single instance in my life where I have ever had any connection with or any knowledge of any other secret political organization. So much for the gentleman's charge against me on that score.

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I did not charge the gentleman as belonging to the Knights of the Golden Circle. If I were so understood I here distinctly disavow any such intention. I think I did not say so. I only said that such an organization existed; and I regarded it as under the protection and direction of the Democratic party.

Mr. LONG. Such an organization may exist for aught I know, but I have no knowledge of it, and no communication with it. I do not know that any such organization exists; I trust in God that it has no existence. I carry no banner; I sound no key-note; I speak for no party. I know that I utter sentiments which those on this side of the House disapprove; but I say what I believe to be true, and what my judgment dictates to be right. I have said it because it meets the approval of my own judgment. I stand upon it. I believe there is no power under the Constitution to coerce sovereign States in the Union. Following the lead of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. STREVENSON.] I am opposed to coercing them out of the Union. I referred to the authorities sustaining me in that position, and if the gentleman [Mr. GARFIELD] were so quick in his response to the doctrine, I ask him why he did not rise in his place and make the same denunciation against the leader of his own party, [Mr. STREVENSON] when he made his speech at an early day of the session in reference to the position of the Southern States?

Mr. GARFIELD. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARFIELD. If the gentleman will refer to the speech on confiscation which I had the honor to deliver, he will see that I dissented from the doctrine of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in very pointed and precise terms.

Mr. LONG. That is all very true. I have read the gentleman's speech. I think I also heard him say upon another occasion that he would leap over the barriers of the Constitution to put down this rebellion. I think I heard that escape from his lips during this session.

Mr. GARFIELD. I said what I did say upon that occasion with great circumspection and care, and all I ask is that the gentleman will fairly quote me, as I presume he intended to do. In reply to the gentleman from the central district of Ohio [Mr. Cox] who is not now in his seat, when he asked me if I would break the Constitution, I answered that I would not break the Constitution at all unless it should become necessary to overleap its barriers to save the Union. I did not say then, as I do say now, that on such an occasion I would overleap the barriers of the Constitution, but I would leap into the arms of a willing people who made the Constitution.

Mr. LONG. Then I give my colleague credit for honesty and frankness. The difference between him and me to-day is that while he would violate that oath which he took before that desk the first day of the session, and would overleap the barriers of the Constitution which he has sworn to support, I choose rather to stand on this floor and be denounced as a traitor for keeping my obligation to my country, to my own conscience, and to my God. That is the difference between my colleague and myself on that point.

I know my colleague replied in his speech to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. STEVENS,] but he did not reply in the tone, the manner, in the style, nor with the force with which he has replied to me to-day. He made a regular common, plain, set speech, dissenting from the views of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but he nowhere in any part of his speech, as I recollect it, denounced him once as a traitor, or disloyal, or faithless to his Government.

Mr. GARFIELD. In the remarks the gentleman has just made he has mistaken me again. Though I have no personal pride for what I did say, I wish the gentleman not to understand that I made a set speech. I will say to him here that I had not one note other than that what I took while the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINCK] was speaking who preceded me. It was not a set speech, but made for a particular and specific purpose at the time.

Mr. LONG. I accord to the gentleman the full benefit of his explanation. I supposed it was a set speech; but I am perfectly willing that he should put himself right before the House. He certainly was sincere in what he said then, and he is certainly sincere to-day when he says he would leap over the barriers of the Constitution. There must be sincerity on the part of my colleague when he puts himself in that position. Upon that point I have done.

I choose rather to consult my own conscience and judgment than to follow his lead in the ranks of a party that is always ready to take the oath to support the Constitution with a mental reservation. I have never so taken it, and, so help me God, I never will. I will support the Constitution dispense the threats which may be brought from any quarter, and with the fixed purpose and full determination to stand upon the principles which I have avowed here to-day if I stand solitary and

alone, even if it were necessary to brave bayonets and prisons and all the tyranny which may be imposed by the whole power and force of the Administration. I have deliberately uttered my sentiments in that speech, and I will not retract one syllable of it.

I am willing to trust to time. I am willing to await its arbitrament. If I am mistaken, so much the better for me, the gentleman and the country. Would to God I were mistaken. Would to God I could cherish other convictions that those I have uttered. My earliest aspirations have been for the glory of my country. I have admired its institutions, I have gloried in its statesmen; they have been the pride of my heart. I would make any sacrifice to restore the Union as it was before that unhappy day for this people when the gentleman's party came into power and destroyed the fairest prospects of liberty that Heaven in its mercy ever vouchsafed to man. I would do it, sir, to restore the Government; but I cannot see restoration by the power of the bayonet. Looking at the history of such struggles in the Old World and in South America and elsewhere, I can see nothing but ruin, destruction, and the final overthrow of free government in a continuance of our present policy. I have raised my voice, feeble and humble as it is, against it, because I believe that its continuance will destroy liberty both North and South.

I think, however, my colleague was not entirely honest in the construction he put upon what I said; but he may have misunderstood me. I uttered no sentiment looking to a secession that should be a division from the mouth of the Mississippi to the head of the Ohio river. I uttered no such sentiment. I gave utterance to no such expression. What I did say—and what I said is written out and can be read—was, that when the Government was formed we were not owners of the mouth of the Mississippi, and that we did not own the territory west of the Mississippi river. I did not say that we did not own the Ohio river and the State in which the gentleman and I live; but that we owned no territory west of the Mississippi, and that Florida was held against us. I did then say that if, by the chastisement of Heaven, we should be curtailed to our old territorial dimensions, we could still exist as a free people, and have our republican form of government again. I supposed the gentleman was familiar enough with the history of his country; I supposed that even he, although he has spent part of his time in the army and left it for a seat upon this floor, knew that the northwestern territory extended beyond the Ohio river, was held by Virginia, and formed part of the original territory when the Constitution was adopted. I thought, therefore, that the gentleman did me intentional injustice in the position he ascribed to me. He may not have done so; but if not, he must certainly be very ignorant of the history of his country and of the amount of territory we possessed when the Government was formed.

Mr. Chairman, I have detained the House

much longer than I intended when I rose. I should have been loth to make any response to my colleague if he had not indulged in a personal attack upon me. I should have been reluctant to detain the House at this late hour if he had not seen proper to do what has not been done before on any occasion since the commencement of the session, to get up and denounce me as unfaithful to the Government. Sir, I hurl back the charge. I say that the men who are destroying this Government, destroying these fair prospects of liberty, are the men now in power. They were the authors and originators of all our present difficulties. They first uttered the sentiment that this Government could not exist as our fathers made it; that there was an "irrepressible conflict" which would result either in the overthrow of the institutions of the States on the one side or the overthrow of the Government of the United States on the other.

They inaugurated the conflict which has produced this unfortunate state of things. I have simply recognized the work of their own hands. It ill becomes a man upon that side of the House to assail me. That duty ill becomes a man belonging to a party that has always taken the oath to support the Constitution with a mental reservation, and has declared before the country and before God that the institutions which our fathers established, and the Government which they founded, could not exist as they made it in the beginning, with all its compromises. I believe that the fathers of the Republic were as good as we are. I believe that they were as good Christians and as true patriots. They looked at the institution of slavery not in the light in which these gentlemen look at it now. When they came to the communion table to partake of the sacrament they did not push men away because they held slaves. God prospered them in the revolution and in the formation of the Government. It was a good Government, good enough for me, good enough for my children, and I am willing to make any sacrifice to restore it.

But, sir, we heard these gentlemen of the Republican party in this Hall the other night applauding to the echo the sentiments of a man—George Thompson—who has gloried over the tearing to pieces of our Constitution, the man who originated this separation of the States and this destruction of our civil and political liberties. Such a party I must discard, who thanked God that the hour of compromise was passed and that we were freed from the shackles of the Constitution. I will plant myself, even if it be single and alone, in opposition to a party which plots the destruction of the Government, the overthrow of liberty, and which applauds George Thompson and his sentiments. I would rather live in the State in which the gentleman and I live, with liberty, with a free Government, under the Constitution of our fathers, with my rights political, social, and civil, than live in a great empire under an overshadowing despotism. Give me liberty, even if confined to an island of Greece or a canton

of Switzerland, rather than an empire and a despotism, as we have here to-day.

The Speaker of the House, [Mr. COLFAX,] on the day after the delivery of Mr. LONG's speech, having offered a resolution for his expulsion, and the debate continuing thereon up to April 14th, it was concluded by Mr. LONG addressing the House as follows:

MR. SPEAKER: I should have been glad to be relieved from the necessity of making any remarks upon this most extraordinary occasion. I should have preferred not to address the House on a matter so personal to myself; but the extraordinary circumstances by which I find myself surrounded, the peculiar manner in which this discussion has been conducted, and the importance of the occasion to me individually, seem to demand that I should make a brief response to some of the remarks which have been made by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House.

Sir, I was surprised when I entered the doors of this Hall on Saturday last. The first sound I heard was the clear shrill voice of the Clerk reading a resolution for my expulsion. I was amazed when I learned that the Speaker of this House had left his exalted position and moved that resolution. Nor was I less astounded when I heard the speech which he made in its support.

I do not complain of his having offered the resolution. I do not propose to arraign him for having offered it. I shall indulge in no personalities toward him, or toward any gentlemen on this floor. Let me say now that, with one or two exceptions, I have been treated by all who have participated in this debate with regard and consideration; and whatever may be the result of the vote which the House is about to take upon the question of permitting me longer to occupy a seat here, I shall always recur with gratification to the manner in which I have been referred to personally in the course of this discussion.

My acquaintance with the gentlemen on the other side of the House is limited. There are but few of them, comparatively, with whom I have become intimate. But all of them, with few exceptions, have referred to me in terms of respect and kindness. They have not impugned my motives; they have not found fault with the manner in which I have expressed myself.

Now, sir, for what am I arraigned, for what am I on trial? In what have I offended that I am no longer to be regarded as worthy of membership in this body? In what, that I am an unfit associate of gentlemen on this floor with whom I have been so pleasantly connected for the last four months? What is it? Have I done aught inconsistent with that honorable position to which my constituents elected me? Have I conducted myself on this floor in a manner unbecoming the dignity of a Representative of the people? Have

I been indecorous or disorderly, or in an unseemly manner occupied the time or asked the attention of the House? Have I committed any crime? No, sir, no such charge has been brought against me. But, on the contrary, I have been highly complimented for the manner in which I have expressed my opinions.

What, then, is the offence for which I am arraigned and to be expelled from this floor? It is this: that in this hour of our country's peril, when we are engaged in a war of such magnitude, involving such vast consequences, affecting not only ourselves and our constituents but the cause of free government throughout the world; at this hour, when we have an army in the field which for numbers, prowess, and expensive equipment is unequaled in the history of the world; at this hour, when the war has lasted three years, and when we are daily called upon to vote appropriations of both men and money for its further continuance; when we are urged to harass the people by heavier and multiplied taxation, and to drag them from their homes by repeated conscriptions; that in this hour, believing that a further continuance of the struggle will not only be fruitless, but will ultimately destroy the Republic and with it the liberties of the people, exercising my right as a Representative of a free constituency, moved solely by a desire to prevent an unnecessary and therefore wicked waste of treasure and a further effusion of blood in what I deem to be a fruitless struggle; moved solely by my desire to preserve the liberties of the people and to maintain the principles and form of our Government, even if we could not preserve all its territory, having no sympathy with and no desire to aid its enemies, I have spoken my honest convictions according to the ability which God has given me.

That is the sum and substance of my offending. I have gathered together materials which the master-workmen of the Republican party have prepared ready for my use. I was not obliged to go either to the quarry or to the forest for my material. I found it already prepared by the hands of skillful and experienced workmen, and without the use of ax, hammer, or any tool of iron I have joined it together; the workmanship is that of the leaders of the departed and living statesmen of your party, and the leading journals which mould and shape Republican opinion. I have justified my position by the authority of those master-workmen, the statesmen of the old Whig and Republican parties. They have prepared the materials for me, shaped them in the most delicate manner, and with the utmost skill, and with the greatest powers. They have supplied the arguments which I collected and from which I drew certain conclusions and presented them to the House. Why, sir, I have studied the statesmen whose political sentiments you profess. I have quoted from your present Chief Executive, from the Secretary of State, from men in authority of equal ability. They have maintained certain principles in regard to the administration of the government in time of

war and the coercion of States, and from them I have drawn my conclusions. They forced themselves upon my mind, and I could not resist them. They were that two alternatives only remained to us; neither of them is agreeable to me, but between them I must choose, and for choosing that which I believed to be the least fruitful of evil I am to be expelled from this House.

Now, gentlemen, I ask you to approach that question with care and deliberation. I ask you, before you pass a vote of expulsion or censure upon me, to consider the circumstances in which we are placed and by which we are surrounded to day. It is an important occasion. I expressed my convictions; my colleague [Mr. GARFIELD] replied to me immediately. Many of my own friends did not agree with me. They have taken occasion to say so. My colleagues on this side have, with few exceptions, hastened to express their dissent. They were speedy to confirm my statement that I did not undertake to speak for them. I may be in error. My judgment and conscience tell me that I am not. I may not look at the great struggle in its true light. I have looked at it deliberately in order to discover, if possible, the end to which it was tending. I have formed my conclusions. I believe there are but two issues to which this war can lead; and so believing, independently as a Representative of the people, honestly and candidly as a man, overcome by a sense of duty to my country and responsibility to my God, I have deliberately, courteously, and gentlemen say with great circumspection, expressed my convictions to the House. They commend my manhood and candor; they award me credit for having spoken my honest convictions; but they dissent from my conclusions. That is my offense.

Gentlemen, if there is anything in that, if there is any blame to be attached to me for having thus uttered my convictions, then the God who made me and gave me utterance, and gave me the impulse to say openly what I believe firmly, is to blame, instead of myself. I declared the deliberate conviction of my judgment, I declared the deliberate conclusion of my mind; and having listened with attention to the arguments of gentlemen, I have not yet heard one which has moved me from my position. I may be in error. If you are still further to govern us, I trust, for my country, that I may be. But do not, gentlemen, trifle with the country. If I am wrong, convince me. Do not, in this hour, gratify partisan aspirations at the expense either of our country or of truth. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROLLINS] sees in this movement what I have thought I also very clearly discerned. He says that it was designed to make party capital, and that the effort is more to see how much can be made out of it for the next campaign than to arrive at just conclusions. He told you that it is all party and no word for the country; all party, from the introduction of the resolution to the hour we are going to vote on it. He is the only gentle-

man on the other side of the Chamber who discussed and combated the principles and arguments of my speech. He did it in a courteous, dignified, and statesmanlike manner; but while I respect him, I must say that he has failed to change my convictions. I may be wrong. I believe I am right. I have not one word to retract. My convictions are as strong, and my judgment as firm as when on Friday I gave utterance to my sentiments.

What, sir, is the position on which I stand? Let me call your attention for a few moments to the means by which I arrived at my conclusions. I built upon the foundation laid by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. STEVENS.] As so much has been said on the subject, I will read a short paragraph from his speech. He says:

"Some think that these States are still in the Union and entitled to the protection of the Constitution and the laws of the United States." * *

"Others hold that having committed treason, renounced their allegiance to the Union, discarded the Constitution and laws, organized a distinct and hostile government, and by force of arms have risen from the condition of insurgents to the position of an independent *Pouvoir de facto*, and having been acknowledged as a belligerent both by foreign nations and our own Government, the Constitution and the Union are abrogated so far as they are concerned, and that as between the two belligerents they are under the laws of war and the laws of nations alone, and that whichever Power conquers may treat the vanquished as conquered provinces, and may impose upon them such conditions and laws as it may deem best." * * *

"But it is said that this must be considered a contest with rebel individuals only, as States in the Union cannot make war. That is true so long as they remain in the Union. But they claim to be out of the Union, and the very fact that we have admitted them to be in a state of war, to be belligerents, shows that they are no longer in the Union, and that they are waging war in their corporate capacity, under the corporate name of the Confederate States, and that such major corporation is composed of minor corporations called States acting in their associated character." * * *

"When an insurrection becomes sufficiently formidable to entitle the party to belligerent rights, it places the contending Powers on precisely the same footing as foreign nations at war with each other." * * *

"No one acquainted with the magnitude of this contest can deny to it the character of a civil war. For nearly three years the Confederate States have maintained their declaration of independence by force of arms." * * *

"What, then, is the effect of this public war between these belligerent, these foreign nations? Before this war the parties were bound together by a compact, by a treaty called a 'Constitution.' They acknowledged the validity of municipal laws mutually binding on each. This war has cut asunder all these ligaments, abrogated all these obligations."

These are the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, word for word, and which were referred to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COLFAX] as if I were their author. I adopted them. I have simply followed in the lead of the distinguished leader of the Republican party. I drew my conclusions from the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which I have not heard him take back.

I know that some gentleman upon this side of the House have denounced him for it; and I know some gentlemen upon that side of the House have disagreed with him. Yet I have not heard of a resolution being introduced for the expulsion or censure of that gentleman. He and I agree. These States are out of the Union; they have established an independent government *de facto*; they have maintained their declaration of independence by force of arms for three years. For three years they have so prosecuted the war that by the laws of war and the laws of nations they have cut asunder all the ligaments and abrogated all the obligations which bound them to us under the Constitution. He and I agree in that opinion. If you condemn me, I ask you to be consistent and condemn your distinguished leader. I might not have been brought to that conclusion had not the argument been placed before me by the leader of the Republican party on this floor. If gentlemen, you censure me for putting myself in position with him you must, to be consistent, censure us both. "Be just, though the heavens fall." Rise above party. If the same words were uttered upon that side of the House as those for which you condemn me, make no difference between me and the member of the Republican party who uttered them; consistency is a jewel. If you must have a victim, if it is necessary that censure should attach somewhere, censure us both; we stand on the same ground; we uttered the same language and hold the same opinion as to the condition of the confederate States.

He goes further than I do. He is for waging war against the Confederate States as a foreign nation for conquest and subjugation. I am against it; the difference is purely a question of policy, which is always a legitimate subject of discussion in a legislative assembly. I believe that if a war of subjugation could be successfully prosecuted against the Confederate States as a foreign nation, and we held and governed them as conquered provinces by the exercise of the coercive power of the Government, the effect would be to destroy the principles of the Union between all the States North as well as South, and establish an absolute despotism upon the ruins of the liberties of the people; and believing this, I am not willing to sacrifice our republican form of government for territorial aggrandizement and the establishment of a despotism.

Now, in another part of my speech, I have quoted from the New York *Tribune*, from the great leading republican paper of my district, the Cincinnati *Commercial*, from the Columbus *Journal*, and from a number of papers which I will not enumerate here. I did not give to the House what those papers said, but I extracted from them the materials which I used in coming to my conclusion. I will now ask the Clerk to read some extracts which were published in the Cincinnati *Commercial* in 1861. That paper is published in my city, and is more influential in moulding Republican opinion in my district than any other paper published in the State.

The Clerk read as follows :

"War for the subjugation of the seceders would be unwise and deplorable. There is no province in the world, conquered and held by military force, that is not a weakness to its master. Many of the English colonies have drained England of her wealth. The English people are now eaten up with taxation to hold distant possessions in military subjection, and carry on a world-wide system of fillbustering, which has for centuries been a national passion. The wars, which are visited upon her in her monstrous national debt, were occasioned by the pride of her aristocracy and the intrigues of her politicians, and were not, with an exception or two, in the interest of her people. India, upon which she has lavished her strength, and which is the most magnificent trophy of wars of conquest held by any nation, is an incumbrance to her to-day. Algiers is a costly and unprofitable appendage of France. Venetia is the weak spot of Austria, and the life's blood of the empire is drained to hold that territory, which is absolutely worthless to the Austrians, and fetters her armies in the Quadrilateral. The history of the world certainly proves that it is not profitable to govern a people without their consent.

"The logical lesson of this fact in this country is that if there are two nations here who have been living in an unnatural union, they should, for the benefit of one or both, be separated. We do not entertain the opinion that a forced alliance between antagonistic nationalities has existed in the Union which our fathers made. We believe, whatever the difference in domestic institutions, in temperament, in soil and climate, and in ideas of local government, to be found within the limits of the land, that each interest was secure within the Union, and that all sections were more prosperous and happy within than they can be without the Union.

"The dream of an ocean-board republic, which has been so grateful to Young America, we yet hope to see realized; but in the mean time there is room for several flourishing nations on this continent; and the sun will shine as brightly and the rivers run as clear—the cotton-fields be as white and the wheat-fields as golden—when we acknowledge the Southern Confederacy as before. We would not undervalue the Union. It has ministered to our national pride as well as to the prosperity of the whole country. But when it is gone, we still have our fruitful and inviting soil and climate, our seats and channels of commerce, and the unequalled capacity of the people for productive labor.

"We are not in favor of blockading the Southern coast. We are not in favor of retaking by force the property of the United States now in possession of the seceders. We would recognize the existence of a government formed of all the seceding States, and attempt to cultivate amicable relations with it."

Mr. LONG. Those articles, as I said before, appeared in the Cincinnati *Commercial*, the leading Republican paper of my own State. There appeared also at the same time a series of articles in the Columbus *Journal*, published in the capital of my State. The articles in the *Commercial* appeared immediately following an interview which took place between the proprietors of that paper and the present Secretary of the Treasury, S. P. Chase, and at the time they were attributed to that distinguished gentleman.

I will not detain the House by referring to the other extracts, but as I said before I found these materials adjusted by the hands of skillful workmen for my use. I choose to go to

the leaders of the Republican party rather than draw from what had been written and said by my own party, feeling that thereby my position would be more impregnable against the assaults of my opponents. I was unwilling to believe that the Republican party would repudiate the utterances of its own great statesmen, leaders, and principal journals, but from demonstrations made on this floor for the last few days I am led to the conclusion that I was most sadly mistaken.

I caution you, gentlemen, on that side of the Chamber to approach the subject carefully. It will be the worst record for you that you can possibly make if you now repudiate these principles. You have before avowed them, and I predict here to day you will be driven to avow them again before another President shall have been inaugurated on the 4th of March, 1865. I warn you, gentlemen, that in voting to expel me from this Hall, or in voting censure upon me for uttering these sentiments which have been avowed by your own leading statesmen and newspapers, you are doing that which will ultimately subject yourselves to a worse odium than that which you are seeking to fasten upon me. Events are progressing rapidly; we know not what a day may bring forth. I do not, in saying this, mean in any degree to intimidate any gentleman, or prevent him from voting as his judgment dictates; but regardless of consequences to myself I make the prediction that you will rue this day, that you will seek to obliterate this record before we shall have dissolved this Congress on the 4th of March next.

I may be in error in the opinions I expressed. Some of my own friends upon this side of the House have planted themselves in opposition to them, and I have received their condemnation. Those who will occupy a position with me in the future upon these great questions will not be those who agree with my distinguished friend on my right, [Mr. SMITH.] But there will be gentlemen from the other side of the House who will come to my principles. I believe that you will come to them, gentlemen. I do not believe that the American people, North or South, will ever agree with the member from Kentucky, [Mr. SMITH,] that we ought to subjugate and exterminate the people of the South, and populate that country with a better class of people. I do not believe that the people of this country, not even of the Republican party, would agree to that. I cannot believe that any man when he lies down on his pillow and communes with his God, when he considers the magnitude of this issue, involving the fate of eight million men, women, and children, could agree to the doctrine of the member from Kentucky.

Mr. SMITH. The gentleman will allow me one moment; I will not occupy more of his time. When I used the expression the day before yesterday that I was willing not only to subjugate the South, but, if need be, to exterminate its people and populate that country with a better class of people, I did not refer to the innocent children who cannot commit treason; but I referred to the men in

arms, to those who have by direction or indication committed treason against the Government.

Mr. LONG. I give the gentleman all the benefit he can derive from his explanation. I regard it as a very feeble effort to extricate himself from the position in which he and other gentlemen here have placed themselves. I envy not the man who can clasp his hands and close his eyes in prayer and ask the extermination of these people at the South. I have no heart and no disposition to see such a work as that go on. I cannot consent to it. So help me God, I am against it. Standing as I do among you alone, I am willing to raise my voice, feeble as it is, against it. I want peace in this country; peace, peace, if I can have it, rather than the extermination of these people who are struggling in a cause which they believe to be right. Sir, let this war cease. I, for one, am against it. Although I may be expelled from this Hall, and sent home to my constituents branded by the condemnation of the gentlemen opposite, I will utter the convictions of my judgment; I will take the consequences, and will go down, if you please, to infamy, if such is the estimation in which I am to be held, for raising my feeble voice for peace.

Sir, I dislike personalities, and I intend to be respectful to all gentlemen. I must, nevertheless, point out what in my judgment is an inconsistency on the part of the gentleman who has moved this resolution of expulsion.

On the 11th day of February, 1861, Mr. Craige, of North Carolina, submitted on the floor of this House the following resolution. I read from the *Congressional Globe*, second session Thirty-sixth Congress, part one, page 853:

"Mr. CRAIGE, of North Carolina. I submit the following resolution:

"Whereas the States of South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and Louisiana have seceded from the Confederacy of the United States and have established a government under the name of 'the Confederacy of the United States South;' and whereas it is desirable that the most amicable relations should exist between the two Governments, and war should be avoided as the greatest calamity which can befall them:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, required to acknowledge the independence of said government as soon as he is informed officially of its establishment; and that he receive such envoy, ambassador, or commissioner as may or shall be appointed by said government for the purpose of amicably adjusting the matters in dispute with said government.

"Mr. CRAIGE, of North Carolina. I hope that the resolution will be permitted to pass, as I doubt not it is the wish of all of us that peace shall be preserved.

"Mr. FARNSWORTH. I object; and move that it be referred to the Committee on Patents. [Laughter.]

"Mr. CRAIGE, of North Carolina. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

"The question was taken; and the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, on the 11th day of February, 1861, Mr. Craige, an avowed secessionist, who was in favor of dissolving the Union, who carried out his views and went South, proposed, in his place here, a recognition of the confederacy, and to put in that diplomatic gallery an envoy extraordinary from the confederate States. And this resolution was dignified in this House by a reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COLFAX] was present and assented to that reference. He probably voted for it. He moved no resolution of censure, no resolution of expulsion.

There is another circumstance to which I wish to allude. It has been referred to before, but I choose to refer to it again. Mr. Conway, a member from the State of Kansas, in a speech which he made in this House on the 27th day of January, 1863, uses this language, before proposing two resolutions. I read from *Congressional Globe* and Appendix, third session Thirty-Seventh Congress, part two, page 66 of the Appendix:

"Nevertheless, I cannot refrain from expressing my individual opinion that the true policy of the North is to terminate this war at once. The longer it continues the worse our situation becomes. Let the two Houses of Congress adopt the following resolutions:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, &c. That the Executive be and he is hereby requested to issue a general order to all commanders of forces in the several military departments of the United States to discontinue offensive operations against the enemy and to act for the future entirely on the defensive.

"Resolved, That the Executive be, and he is hereby, further requested to enter into negotiations with the authorities of the confederate States with reference to a cessation of hostilities based on the following propositions; first, recognition of the independence of the confederate states; second, a uniform system of duties upon imports; third, free trade between the two States; fourth, free navigation of the Mississippi river; fifth, mutual adoption of the Monroe doctrine.

"I am aware that this may be said to be giving up the contest. In one respect it undoubtedly is. It is an abandonment, for the time being, of the attempt to bring the South under the sway of the Union by force of arms. But it cannot be denied that in this object we are already defeated; we have defeated ourselves."

Did I every say as much? Have I admitted that we were defeated? Have I denied the prowess of the Federal Army? Have I denied its ability to exterminate the South? Not a syllable can be pointed out in my speech which looks to any such idea. Have I ever once claimed that the Federal army was not able to cope with or overpower the Confederates and exterminate the Southern people? I object to their extermination. I have not admitted, as Mr. Conway did, that we were defeated. I have not been willing to give up the contest in that respect.

And why do I refer to this now? I refer to it, sir, for this purpose: to show that as well on the 11th of February, 1861, as on the 27th of January, 1863, the present Speaker of this House occupied a seat on this floor and heard

these resolutions offered. He heard the speech of Mr. Conway. And he, so far as I am advised, moved no resolution of expulsion or censure against either of those members.

It has been said that what has been declared by the leaders of the Republican party against coercing the States was uttered before the war began and before blood was shed. It is true this gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Craige) used that language and offered this resolution before blood was shed. Mr. Conway used his language and offered his resolution after we had been engaged in war two years. The army was as near to the Potomac then as it is to-day. Washington city was surrounded then as it is surrounded now. The President was guarded then in his mansion by armed sentinels as I said on last Friday: he is guarded now. This gentleman (Mr. Conway) said that we had defeated ourselves; and he proposed a recognition of the Southern Confederacy. He proposed that the President should recognize it. Where was the gentleman from Indiana then? Where was his resolution of expulsion, where his resolution of censure against Mr. Conway? Where was all his virtuous indignation and his loud-sounding patriotism then? Why did he not stop the business of legislation long enough at least to make an effort at expulsion or censure? What is the difference between us, sir?

On the 27th day of January, 1863, the war had progressed for two years; it now has progressed three. On the 27th of January, 1863, the Speaker who now proposes my expulsion was on the floor of the House, and now he is in the Speaker's chair. Because he occupies that position, does it give him any higher right, does it give him any higher power? I think it does not. The only difference between my conduct and that of Mr. Conway, was that he was an abolitionist and I am a Democrat. Therefore I am to be expelled, while he goes without censure or disapprobation. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. COX. I hope the Chair will preserve order. [Laughter.] I presume he will not hesitate to clear the galleries now.

Mr. LONG. I came into this House and delivered my speech on Friday. The Speaker of the House knew that I was going to deliver it and manifested much kindness in respect to it. He evinced much disposition to give me the floor. Other gentlemen on the other side of the House knew I was going to deliver it, and I told them I would go a bow-shot beyond anything that had been yet said.

Mr. COLFAX. The gentleman will bear me witness that he never said anything of that character to me.

Mr. LONG. Certainly I did not say that to the Speaker, but I did to a number of gentlemen now in their seats on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will allow me for a moment, I want to know from gentlemen on the other side of the House whether some of them were not advised when they went into the Hall on Friday last of the pre-

cise character of the speech he proposed to make, and that it would be for the recognition of the South?

Mr. LONG. I cannot yield further to my colleague.

Mr. COX. I charge that upon the other side of the House, and then that they undertook to circulate the speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. I will take care of that. I do not yield to my colleague further.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I delivered that speech in this House, as gentlemen have been kind enough to tell me, very well. I thought it was delivered very badly. I was quite dissatisfied with myself for the manner in which it was delivered. During its delivery the Speaker did me the honor to listen to me. My eye was upon him. A gentleman upon the other side of the House, [Mr. ASHLEY,] who knew in advance the character of the speech, gave me his attention; and after I had nearly completed its delivery, after I had laid down my premises, and drawn my conclusions, after I had not only laid the foundations, but nearly erected the superstructure, and the hammer fell as my hour expired, the distinguished Republican from Illinois [Mr. WASHBURN] rose in his place and asked the unanimous consent of the committee to give me time in which to conclude my speech, and in connection with that request the gentleman is reported, and I believe correctly, as follows:

"As the speech of the gentleman from Ohio is the key-note of the Democratic party in the coming election, I hope there will be no objection to his finishing his speech. It means recognition of the Confederacy by foreign Powers, and peace upon terms of disunion."

What says the rule on that point? I find on page 124 of the Rules as follows:

"If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker *shall*, or any member may, call to order; in which case the member so called to order shall immediately sit down, unless permitted to explain; and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case, but without debate."

They knew what I said. They heard me say it. The Speaker heard it and did not feel himself obliged to call me to order. Yet the rule of the House is imperative that he *shall* call to order. So far were they from that that they were willing that I should finish my speech. They gave me unanimous consent to finish it. And my colleague from the Toledo district, [Mr. ASHLEY,] as soon as the speech was delivered, put his name upon the list and subscribed for five hundred copies of it to be circulated as treason. [Laughter.] Yes, sir, a number of gentlemen on that side subscribed for it. The gentleman who took upon himself the responsibility of drawing a parallel between Benedict Arnold and myself subscribed for one hundred copies. [Laughter.] Yet while these gentlemen are doing that, while they are willing to put it forth to the country, reasonable as they say it is, they now demand that I shall be censured or expelled for having uttered it. They have

not generally subscribed for a Democratic speech.

They have treated me with great consideration. They have given me great notoriety. They could not have given me more if I had made an hundred speeches upon this floor of more ability. For the notoriety that they have given me in the last four or five days' proceedings of the House I ought rather to thank than find fault with them. I ought to feel rather complimented than otherwise.

Gold has gone up from 160 to 190. I do not know that my speech has produced it. [Laughter.] There is something mysterious in this matter.

Mr. SCHENCK rose.

Mr. LONG. I cannot yield to my colleague. I never yield to him. I have the utmost respect for almost every other gentleman on that side of the House except my colleague. He does not command in this department. I thank God that he is not a brigadier general on this floor. If he were I should not be permitted to speak to-day.

Mr. SCHENCK, (in a subdued voice.) If I were I would soon send you over the lines. [Laughter near Mr. SCHENCK'S seat.]

Mr. LONG. I have, I say, been treated generally with the highest consideration and respect by gentlemen on the other side of the House. But one member on that side of the House, a member from Pennsylvania, formed a notable exception. He said:

"Among the soldiers of Pennsylvania you would not find one in five hundred who would not brain the gentleman for uttering in camp the doctrines he uttered with impunity in this Hall."

That I may do no injustice to a number of gentlemen from that State who have done me the honor to reply to me, I will say that I mean the man who plays Forrest upon this floor for the amusement of the House, [Mr. KELLEY.] [Laughter.] I dislike to refer to anything he has said; I dislike personalities. Pennsylvania is my native State, and I honor her noble sons whether in the field or elsewhere.

Yet, sir, I despise the man who would appeal to the passions of the soldier in the field to turn his back upon the foe worthy of his steel and assail the citizen at home. It is the appeal of a coward and I despise the man who would make it; I go further and say that out of each five hundred soldiers which Pennsylvania has sent to the field there is not one in whose bosom does not beat a nobler heart than ever pulsed in the breast of the man who would drag them down to the debased level with himself. [Applause.]

Sir, I regret that I am obliged to refer to these personalities. I do not fear the soldier. He never has offered me offense, and I do not believe he ever will. I have a high regard for his intelligence and his valor; he can distinguish between his real and his pretended friends. He can distinguish between his true friends and those who, with professions on their lips, vote always against either increasing his wages or to ministering to his wants when he is actually in distress. I have in

my hand the letter of a soldier, and I propose to read it. I received it this morning, and it is but one of many which I have been receiving daily since last Monday morning, and all in approbation of the position I have taken. The soldier says:

BATTERY —, April 13, 1864.

SIR: Will you be so kind as to send to the subscriber two or three copies of your speech of Friday last if you have it in pamphlet form, and much oblige a soldier who fights for free government, free speech, and the Constitution as it is.

With respect, I remain, yours, sincerely,
Hon. A. LONG.

The name of the battery, company, and State to which he belongs, and present location, are all given; and I may here say that his State is ably represented on both sides of this Chamber. I omit to give his name, company, &c., lest he might be reprimanded by his superior officers.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COX. I ask my friends over the way to allow my colleague [Mr. Long] to proceed to the conclusion of his remarks. How much time does my colleague want?

Mr. LONG. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. COX. My colleague wants only fifteen minutes to conclude his defense.

Mr. COLFAX. I hope the request will be granted.

No objection was made.

Mr. LONG. I thank gentlemen for extending my time. I shall be very brief in my concluding remarks.

Now, sir, I apprehend that gentlemen upon that side of the House have mistaken the character of the American people. I am satisfied that they have placed too low an estimate upon their patriotism and intelligence when they undertake to shut out from them free speech upon this floor. I am willing to trust them with the largest liberty; and I venture to say that had it not been for interfering with free speech, had it not been for opening the door of the bastille for incarcerating men for doing what we have been doing here to-day, we should have been in a better condition to-day, our Government would have been more prosperous, and we would have been nearer the restoration of the Union.

If this principle is to be carried out, why allow the papers from Richmond to come through the lines, and their articles to be copied into our papers and circulated throughout the land? Why are you not willing to allow the people to have light? Why do you propose to keep them in darkness? You call upon them to respond in taxes and in men to carry on this war. While you ask that of them, they want to know what you propose to do; they want to know how you are going to terminate this war; and they want free discussion and free debate. I am willing to trust them. You all think about these matters; if you do not you are not up to the high mission you are charged with in coming here. If you have not reflected how you are going to terminate this issue, if you have no programme, if you are afraid of free discus-

sion, if you are afraid of the expression of our sentiments, you are not discharging the high duty of American statesmen.

I have risked my connection with my party, for they have denounced me, but I have done what I considered to be my duty fearlessly and candidly. I am not willing to believe, so far as I am concerned, that gentlemen upon the other side of the House will strike down free speech in my person.

I have heard reference made to a number of noble Englishmen when our grandfathers were struggling, as mine were, upon the battle-field to achieve our liberties here. I have already heard quoted upon this floor what they said, but I have one or two quotations which I desire to make which have not been referred to. It will be remembered that after the Declaration of Independence there was almost a unanimity among the English people; the Parliament was united, and the ministers carried their measures by a vote of more than three-fourths of the members of that body. And, sir, in the discussion of an address in answer to the Crown, Mr. Fox used this language:

"It has been said that we are reduced to the dilemma of conquering or abandoning America. If that be the alternative, I am for abandonment."

Now, sir, when was that said? It was said in October or November 1776, after the battle of Long Island and the capture of the city of New York by British arms. It was said, sir, at the time when everything looked favorable to the subjugation of the colonies upon this continent by the British Government. Mr. Fox had the manhood to rise in the British Parliament at that time and declare that if the alternative was presented between conquering the colonies or abandoning them, he was for abandonment; and who ever heard of a resolution offered for censuring him? As early in the history of the Revolution as 1777 Mr. Pitt used similar language in reference to the colonies. He said that in order to save the body he was willing to amputate the limbs, and let the colonies go. Who ever denounced or censured him for using that language?

But, sir, let me call the attention of the House to the language of the younger Pitt in favor of Fox's motion for a committee on the American war in the year 1781. I quote from Mahon's History of England, volume seven, page 135:

"For my part, I am persuaded and will affirm, that it is a most accursed, wicked, barbarous, cruel, unnatural, unjust, and diabolical war. It was conceived in injustice; it was nurtured and brought forth in folly; its footsteps were marked with blood, slaughter, persecution, devastation."

Strong, sir, as that language is, it was permitted in the British Parliament, without expulsion, censure or even rebuke in any form.

Again, sir, hear the language of Lord Chatham on the same subject. He said:

"The desperate state of our arms abroad is in part known. No man thinks more highly of them than I do; I love and honor the English troops; I know their virtues and their valor; I know they

can achieve anything except impossibilities; and I know that the conquest of English America is an impossibility. You cannot, I venture to say it, YOU CANNOT conquer America." * * * "My LORDS, you CANNOT conquer America." * * * "As to conquest, therefore, my lords, I repeat it is impossible. You may swell every expense and every effort still more extravagantly; pile and accumulate every assistance you can buy or borrow; traffic and barter with every little pitiful German prince that sell his subjects to a foreign prince; your efforts are forever vain and impotent—doubly so from this mercenary aid on which you rely; for it irritates, to an incurable resentment, the minds of your enemies—to overrun them with the mercenary sons of rapine and plunder; devoting them and their possessions to the rapacity of hiring cruelty! If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms—never, never, never."

Who ever heard of a resolution of expulsion or censure for the utterance of those sentiments? These men might have been mistaken. Time and events have proved that they were correct, and that they appreciated the magnitude of the great issue in which their country was involved. But whether they were right or wrong, whether mistaken or not, the British Parliament tolerated that difference of opinion and maintained the freedom of speech. Sir, are we less enlightened to day, are our people not as intelligent as the English people were then? Can they not discriminate between the truth and error? Cannot they draw the line between patriotism and treason? Can they not rise, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROLLINS] said above party politics and look to the interests of their country? They can judge whether a man discussing these great questions is right or wrong. But, sir, give him free speech; do not strike him down in the American Congress; do not strike him down in this enlightened age, in the middle of the nineteenth century, when we boast of our free speech and pride ourselves upon our intelligence and discriminating justice. Let the people decide. Let us go to the people, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SMITH] proposed. Let the discussion commence here and let it extend to the people.

This great question must be discussed. You may strike me down for having dared to approach it upon this floor—you have the power in point of numbers to do so—but the eyes of the American people are upon you and will hold you to an account for having stifled free speech and the freedom of debate in the Halls of the American Congress. The cant about loyalty has served to conceal your designs and shut out discussion long enough. The people demand light. They have been patient, patriotic, and enduring beyond measure; they are still so; but they want to know what the final results of all this sacrifice of men and treasure is to be, and what form of government they are to live under hereafter. The discussion of these questions is more important to them than who shall be elected President next November.

[Here the hammer fell.]

